

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION**

1516 NINTH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512



August 11, 2000

Mr. Gary Chandler  
Project Manager  
Mountainview Power Company, LLC  
25770 San Bernardino Avenue  
San Bernardino, CA 92408

Dear Mr. Chandler,

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT PROJECT DATA REQUESTS**

Pursuant to Title 20, California Code of Regulations, section 1716, the California Energy Commission staff requests the information specified in the enclosed data requests. The information requested is necessary to: 1) more fully understand the project, 2) assess whether the facility will be constructed and operated in compliance with applicable regulations, 3) assess whether the project will result in significant environmental impacts, 4) assess whether the facilities will be constructed and operated in a safe, efficient and reliable manner, and 5) assess potential mitigation measures.

This second set of data requests (#125-164) is being made in the areas of biological cultural resources, land use, noise, visual resources. Written responses to the enclosed data requests are due to the Energy Commission staff on or before September 11, 2000, or at such later date as may be mutually agreed.

If you are unable to provide the information requested, need additional time, or object to providing the requested information, you must send a written notice to both Commissioner Michal D. Moore, Ph. D., Presiding Committee Member for the Mountainview Power Plant Project proceeding, and to me, within 15 days of receipt of this notice. The notification must contain the reasons for not providing the information, the need for additional time and the grounds for any objections (see Title 20, California Code of Regulations section 1716 (e)).

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed data requests, please contact me at (916) 653-1245 or e-mail [jreede@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jreede@energy.state.ca.us).

Sincerely,

James W. Reede, Jr.  
Energy Facility Siting Project Manager

Enclosure  
cc: Mountainview Mailing Lists

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**Technical Area:** Biological Resources

**Authors:** Natasha Nelson / Rick York

**Technical Senior:** Dr. Jim Brownell

**BACKGROUND**

The applicant's response to Data Request #22 included an outline of the BRMIMP.

**DATA REQUESTS**

125. Please identify if the BRMIMP will specifically address a comprehensive revegetation plan (particularly for the alluvial fan scrub) and measures for weed abatement in all natural areas within Section 8.2?

**BACKGROUND**

Currently the City of Redlands discharges its treated waste-water from its plant into the Santa Ana Wash, which presumably aids in sustaining the riparian vegetation adjacent to the existing power plant site. Under the current proposal, treated waste-water could be piped to the power plant site, for use.

**DATA REQUESTS**

126. Could this proposal potentially have an impact on the amount of discharge, and secondarily to the riparian community within the Santa Ana River channel?
127. If it could impact the riparian community, what does MVPC propose as mitigation to reduce or eliminate this impact?

**BACKGROUND**

If the pipeline crossing at Twin Creek cannot be hung on an existing bridge, the potential for impact of the southwestern pond turtle (Sections 6.13.1.2.3 and 6.13.1.3.2 of the AFC indicates a possible sighting) needs to be addressed in detail by the applicant.

**DATA REQUEST**

128. Staff requests that the applicant clarify if a bridge hanging is the proposed method and submit a clearance survey for this species.

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**BACKGROUND**

The power plant site is currently being annexed by the City of Redlands. However, the applicant has not provided the goals or policies from the City of Redlands General Plan that may be applicable to biological resources (see Table 6.13-3).

**DATA REQUEST**

129. Staff requests the applicant submit a review of the Redlands General Plan for LORS applicable to biological resources.

**BACKGROUND**

Staff is concerned about the indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed project on sensitive biological resources and their habitat. Since the power plant is sited close to the Santa Ana River, and the natural gas and water pipelines may cross waterways with significant biological resources, staff needs to gain a better understanding of the potential indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed project on the local biological resources.

**DATA REQUESTS**

130. Please indicate the location and acreage of the staging areas for the potential proposed boring under Etiwanda Creek/Wash, and directional drilling the Santa Ana River at Tippecanoe.
131. Please indicate how this activity is anticipated to affect the hydrological regime in the short- and long-term.
132. The potential impacts during the installation of the natural gas line within a Delhi Sands location should be clarified.
133. Please submit a table showing the temporary impacts that would be anticipated under pavement versus along the side of the road?

**BACKGROUND**

The regional environment describes the Santa Ana river as a functional wildlife corridor (page 6.13-1 of the AFC, last line).

**DATA REQUESTS**

Please provide a discussion of:

134. Would the project impact the river's use as a wildlife corridor during construction at Tippecanoe, or over the long-term, as a result of the light and noise effects of the proposed generator units

MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)

**BACKGROUND**

Additional discussion of sensitive plant communities and the impacts to them is needed for staff to make a complete determination of the proposed project's effect on the natural environment.

**DATA REQUESTS**

135. Provide discussion on the potential for direct temporary or permanent and indirect impacts on the following sensitive plant species that have been documented to occur in the general vicinity of the project site:
  - *Calochortus plummerae* (FSOC) – rocky/sandy sites on alluvial material
  - *Caulanthus simulans* (FSOC) – frequently in disturbed areas, such as streambeds.
  - *Chorizanthe parryi* var. *parryi* (FSOC) – dry sandy soils
  - *Hemizonia pungens* ssp. *laevis* (FSOC) – disturbed places
  - *Monardella pringlei* (FSOC) – sandy hills
  - *Ribes divaricatum* var. *parishii* (FSOC) – riparian woodlands

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**Technical Area: Cultural Resources**

**Author:** Jeanette McKenna, Dorothy Torres, Gary Reinoehl

**BACKGROUND**

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provides listings for local Native Americans that should be contacted when projects are initiated in a particular area. Apparently there was an error and the names of some organizations and people located near the project site did not appear on the list provided by the NAHC. Energy Commission Staff provided the applicant with an additional list.

**DATA REQUEST**

136. In order to ensure that there are no misunderstandings regarding information sent to Native Americans, please provide copies of all correspondence sent to inform Native Americans on the additional NAHC list concerning the project.

**BACKGROUND**

A review of the records search data showed that numerous historic road alignments were located in the vicinity of the project area. Mill Street in San Bernardino and Randall Avenue in Fontana appear to be within the project Area of Potential Effects (APE).

**DATA REQUEST**

137. Please submit Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523 (DPR 523) to document the physical evidence that the alignment(s) of Mill Street in San Bernardino and Randall Avenue in Fontana have been adequately recorded and assessed for impacts resulting from the proposed project.
138. In addition, please evaluate each resource for significance according to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15064.5, (a),(3), (A)(B)(C) & (D).

**BACKGROUND**

Revised Table 40-B was submitted in response to discussion in the data request workshop on July 26, 2000. The revision was a supplemental table identifying potential impacts to known or pending cultural resources (Table 40-B).

**DATA REQUEST**

139. Were any of the pending sites listed in Table 40-B verified via field studies? If any were verified, please provide documentation to show they were recorded (DPR 523) and assessed for impacts resulting from the proposed project. If they have not been verified, please verify them and provide copies of the DPR 523. If the resource was previously recorded,

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

please provide an updated record (DPR 523) that includes information about the resource within the project APE, including a sketch map.

140. A number of resources have been identified as "Unknown"- a reference to the presence of the resources within the Area of Direct Impacts (ADI) ADI/APE. Please add to Table 40 B a clear statement as to the presence of these resources in the APE.
141. In addition, please evaluate all resources identified within the APE for significance according to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15064.5, (a), (3), (A)(B)(C) & (D).

**BACKGROUND**

It is necessary that staff assess potential impacts to identified cultural resources.

**DATA REQUEST**

142. On maps Figure 1a, 1b & 1c, please indicate all laydown areas to be used for the proposed project site, preferred gas line and water line interconnection.

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**Technical Area: Land Use**

**Author: Michael Berman/Pat Angell (PMC)**

**BACKGROUND**

A review of Figure 2.15-3 Site Development and the other portions of the project description in the application did not provide enough information to indicate how the project relates to the proposed project site and local agency regulatory requirements. City of Redlands Development Code provisions require that there be landscaped setbacks of 10 feet within the 25-foot building setback, adequate street right-of-way (110 feet cross-section and 52 feet centerline to curb) and street improvements are provided. Since the two diagrams are inconsistent it is difficult to ensure compliance with City standards.

**DATA REQUEST**

143. Revise Figure 2.15-3 Site Development in the application to provide the following:
  - A. Location of all existing exterior lot lines with dimensions to existing and proposed structures.
  - B. Location of the centerline of San Bernardino Avenue and Mountain View Avenue with dimensions to existing, exterior property lines.
  - C. Location of existing and proposed curb and gutter with dimensions to exterior property lines.
  - D. Locations with dimensions for any areas of building setback that will be landscaped.

**BACKGROUND**

City of Redlands Sign Ordinance Sections 15-36.230 and 15-36.200B govern the size, location, and type of signs permitted on the project site. The application materials provide no indication of the signs proposed by the applicant. It is not possible to demonstrate compliance with the City Zoning ordinance from existing data submitted.

**DATA REQUEST**

144. Provide a sign program that includes the following:
  - A. The location, size and number of all signs proposed.
  - B. The materials that will be used to construct the signs.
  - C. The lighting technique that will be used for the signs.
  - D. The height that signs will be located.

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

- E. The type of signs to be used (For example, a monument sign or a building mounted sign).
- F. If signs will be located on buildings identify the distance from the surface of the sign to the surface of the structure to which it will be attached.
- G. An architectural rendering of all signs proposed.
- H. The content of each sign proposed.

**BACKGROUND**

A comparison of Figure 2.15-3 Site Development with the Development Agreement Map (submitted in response to Data Request # 56) indicates there is some confusion about the dimension of the proposed site plan in relation to the property for which the project is proposed. Our review of the project must establish that the building setback requirements and roadway dedications are consistent with City standards. Since the data are not consistent it is difficult to evaluate project consistency with City of Redlands standards.

**DATA REQUEST**

- 145. In addition to the data requested in Data Request 1 above verify that the revised Figure 2.15-3 Site Development (in the application) dimensions are the same as the legal parcel for which it is proposed. This can be done by providing overall site dimensions on Figure 2.15-3 Site Development that are less than or the same as those on the Assessors Parcel Map.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposed natural gas line extension will proceed through several different jurisdictions. At least one of these jurisdictions will require a franchise agreement if the proposed pipeline is proprietary but not if the gas pipeline is a part of a regulated utility. We need to know what permits and agreements that applicant will need to obtain.

**DATA REQUEST**

- 146. Indicate if the proposed natural gas pipeline extension will be proprietary or not.

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Redlands Development Code restricts lot coverage in the M-2 District that includes the project site. The site plan does not provide calculations of the site area and the aerial extent of proposed roofed structures. This data is required to evaluate project compliance with zone lot coverage requirements.



**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**DATA REQUEST**

147. Provide calculations of the aerial extent of the project site (i.e. the entire ultimate legal parcels proposed for development) in square feet. Provide calculations of the aerial extent of proposed and existing structures with roofs in square feet to show consistency with City of Redlands M-2 District lot coverage standards.

**BACKGROUND**

City of Redlands Development Code requirements indicates that storage areas on the site are to be enclosed with various optional techniques. The applicant has indicated on the site visit that there will be materials stored outdoors in the northwest of the site when development of the site is complete. To verify that the applicant is complying with City requirements for storage we need additional data about the proposed outdoor storage.

**DATA REQUEST**

148. What type of barrier is proposed to enclose outdoor storage areas? How high will the barrier be and what materials will be used to construct the barrier? What maintenance will be performed on the proposed barrier? What will the maximum storage height for stored materials be? Indicate the size of setbacks for the outdoor storage area from front, side, and rear yard property lines. Show the outdoor storage area on Figure 2.15-3 in addition to data requested in Data Requests 1 and 3 above, and 8, and 9 below.

**BACKGROUND**

City of Redlands Development Code requirements indicates that no combustible materials may be stored within 25 feet of an interior lot line. We need to verify that no combustible materials will be stored in this area.

**DATA REQUEST**

149. Confirm that no combustible materials will be stored within 25 feet of an interior lot line.

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Redlands Development Code requires that wastes are to be enclosed in an area accessible to service vehicles. The data submitted by the applicant does not indicate where this enclosure will be located.

**DATA REQUEST**

150. Include on Figure 2.15-3 Site Development in the application an enclosure sufficient to accommodate site municipal waste. Ensure that sufficient turning radii are provided and access for service vehicles is adequate.

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Redlands Development Code requires one parking space for each two employees on the largest shift plus one additional parking space for each vehicle connected with the use. The Code also requires a loading space not less than 10 feet wide, 20 feet long, and 14 feet high. Materials submitted by the applicant do not illustrate the location and number of parking spaces. These data are necessary to ensure compliance with City standards.

**DATA REQUEST**

151. Include on Figure 2.15-3 Site Development in the application or provide a separate coordinated exhibit that illustrates the location, layout, and number of parking spaces that will be provided on the site. Also, illustrate where the dimensioned loading dock will be located. Specify the minimum vertical clearance over the loading space.

**BACKGROUND**

A windshield survey was conducted of the project site to verify the identification of sensitive receptor land uses in Figures 6.3.2a, b, and c. Several discrepancies were identified between the uses shown in the figures and those seen on the field visit. It is important that all sensitive receptors are properly identified to facilitate accurate impact evaluation.

**DATA REQUEST**

152. Revise Figure 6.3-2 a, b, and c in the application or indicate why the figure should not be revised to reflect the following:
  - A. A racetrack (recreational use) is located on the southwest corner of Cherry and Merrill Avenue.
  - B. A church (Pentecostal Church of God) is located north of Merrill Avenue between Cypress and Olive.
  - C. Two churches (First United Methodist and Church of Christ) are located at the southwest corner of Athol and Sierra Avenue.
  - D. The elementary school on the eastside of Oleander and south of Merrill is shown as a cultural facility (#1). Does this facility contain both uses? Revise the figure to reflect the uses that occur at this location.
  - E. A religious use shown on the south side of Bloomington Avenue (i.e. #7) could not be located in the field. Confirm that this use occurs in the location shown on Figure 6.3-2b or remove this from the figure.
  - F. A church was identified north of Merrill Avenue and west of the educational institution identified as number 6 in Figure 6.3-2b.
  - G. A boarding home was located south of Mill Street just west of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad Line. Verify the nature of this use is not sensitive.

MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)

- H. A veteran's baseball field is located west of the golf course (number 8) and south of the San Bernardino Airport.
- I. A long-term health care facility is located west of Mountain View Avenue in the vicinity of the educational use identified as number 10 on Figure 6.3-2c. This cluster of buildings appears to accommodate several uses. Ensure that Figure 6.3-2c accurately reflects the uses in this area.

Figure 6.3-2c does not show a bowling alley as a recreational use south of San Bernardino Avenue and west of the proposed water pipeline connection and the drainage that flows into the Santa Ana River. It was not clear during the filed visit that this use is still in operation. Verify whether this use is still in operation and locate it on Figure 6.3-2c if appropriate.

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**Technical Area: Noise**

**Author:** Tom Murphy

**BACKGROUND**

In the AFC, the applicant has concluded that noise impacts from project construction and operation will be insignificant. This conclusion is based on projections of construction and operation noise levels. Staff needs clarification of several of these projections.

**DATA REQUESTS**

153. Section 6.4.3.1 (page 6.4-3) – Describe the operational hours for the existing power plant. For example, does the existing power plant run 24-hours a day or only during peak hours? Provide us with the typical operating hours for the existing power plant in winter, spring, summer and fall.
154. Table 6.4-2 lists the closest residential receptor as being 200 feet southwest of the plant. Is that 200 feet southwest of the facility boundary or is it 200 feet southwest of the power plant (existing or new plant)?
155. The CEC (as well as CEQA) requires the analysis of cumulative impacts in the AFC process. There is no discussion of cumulative noise impacts in the AFC. However, we did find a generic cumulative discussion in the Land Use Section (Section 6.3). Provide us with a detailed discussion of whether or not any potential cumulative impacts would occur from the construction and operation of this power plant.
156. Section 6.4.1.3 on page 6.4-6 provides a summary table (Table 6.4-3) of noise measurements at nearby residential properties during existing power plant operations. What time were the noise measurements taken? How long were the noise-recording periods? Were there any noise measurements taken during the night hours (10 pm to 6 am)? This may not be important if the existing power plant does not operate at night.
157. One of the issues we investigate during the PSA process is whether the new power plant would cause any tonal and intermittent noises that would be audible offsite and would be considered an annoyance to local residences. Describe any tonal or intermittent noise levels that would be associated with this power plant.

**MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)**

**Technical Area: Visual Resources**

**Author:** Michael Clayton

**BACKGROUND**

The Applicant's response to Data Request 112 included the proposal "to install a combination of berm and/or specimen size trees" in the area of the SART. The proposal also indicated that the specimen trees should have adequate time to provide sufficient screening.

**DATA REQUEST**

158. Please provide a complete description of the vegetation planting plan that includes the types and numbers of trees to be planted as well as a plan that shows the location of each tree to be planted. Please provide eight copies of the planting plan. The planting plan should also indicate the maximum height and canopy dimensions at maturity for each tree type as well as the time needed to reach maturity. Also, describe the agency consultation process that will be undertaken to insure the review and participation of the appropriate regional planning agencies responsible for developing and implementing the SART in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project site.
159. Please provide eight sets of visual simulations of the proposed vegetative screening at 5 years and at full maturity as viewed from the revised KOP 4 location on the SART.

**BACKGROUND**

There are a number of residences located in close proximity to the proposed plant along Mountainview Avenue, Victoria Avenue (west of Mountainview Ave.), and San Bernardino Avenue (also west of Mountainview Ave.). The AFC does not include visual simulations or photographs representative of the various views that these residences would have from their properties. Of particular concern are the residences along Mountainview Avenue and the residences on the south sides of Victoria Avenue and San Bernardino Avenue near the intersection with Mountainview Avenue.

**DATA REQUEST**

160. Please provide a series of photographs of the proposed project from Mountainview Avenue, Victoria Avenue, and San Bernardino Avenue that would be representative of the views from the residential properties along these streets. Please provide eight sets of photographs.

**BACKGROUND**

The Applicant is proposing to install a 4.4MW "black start" IC engine (diesel) that would run up to 200 hours per year. It is understood that the stack would be 120 feet tall and

MOUNTAINVIEW POWER PLANT  
DATA REQUESTS  
(00-AFC-2)

18 inches in diameter. According to CEC Air Quality staff, the stack would emit a visible black cloud. The Applicant has been asked to verify the height of the stack in Air Quality Data Request 14. The addition of a new stack of this height is considered a significant visual component of the proposed project for which no analysis has been provided to date. Furthermore, the visibility of a "black cloud" emanating from the new stack, even if for a short time, would impart a substantially more "heavy" industrial character to the proposed project and is therefore, considered a significant component of the proposed project. No description of this additional plume or any analysis of its visibility and potential impact has been provided.

**DATA REQUEST**

161. Please verify the height of the proposed additional stack and describe the stack's location and its visibility to the four KOPs previously established.
162. Please describe in detail the emissions cloud from the proposed stack including plume dimensions and frequencies as previously provided for the cooling tower plume in the response to Data Request 121.
163. Please revise the photosimulations for KOPs 1 through 4 to include the additional stack. Please provide three sets of revised photosimulations for KOPs 1 through 4.
164. For KOPs 1, 2, and 4, please provide separate simulations (eight sets) that depict the reasonable worst case visible plume from the diesel stack and the typical visible plume (if different than the reasonable worst case plume) from the diesel stack (for those hours that the plume is visible).